1-1-1985

The moral development of children : an empirical study of an in-service program.

Paul J. Sinicrope
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF AN IN-SERVICE PROGRAM

A Dissertation Presented
By

PAUL JEFFREY SINICROPE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1985

School of Education

THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN:
AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF AN IN-SERVICE PROGRAM

A Dissertation Presented
By

PAUL JEFFREY SINICROPE

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. George Forman, Chairperson of Committee

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton, Member

Dr. Edward Tronick, Member

Dr. George Bondra, Member

Dr. Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

To: Dr. Daniel C. Jordan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to all of the people who have supported my efforts in this degree program. First, I would like to thank Dr. George Forman, the newest member of my committee, for agreeing to serve as chairperson. He has guided me through the implementation of the study and the writing of this dissertation. I would also like to thank Dr. Edward Tronick for his support in the dissertation phase of my degree. His trust in me helped in my commitment to complete this degree. Next, to Dr. Ronald Hambleton, my sincere thanks for his encouragement, support and continual demand for quality. From the beginning of my degree, he gave me the motivation to continue in this effort. And to Dr. George Bondra, a friend and a mentor, a special thanks. He gave me the knowledge and understanding that helped me to be a position to carry out this study.

To my wife Cathy, my love for your support that carried me through the difficult times when things were not going well, with sleepless nights and grumpy days. And of course to my parents, Anne and Tony, my love for their push for an education for their children, the prime motivator behind my many years of education. A special thanks to Janet Dielman for her help in many aspects of this

dissertation.

And to Dr. Daniel Jordan, I owe my deepest gratitude. He was my friend and my teacher. He gave me the understanding of what education is about. We love him and miss him, all of us who had the privilege to know him.

ABSTRACT

The Moral Development of Children:
An Empirical Study of an In-Service Program

February 1985

Paul J. Sinicrope,
B.S., Central Connecticut State College
M.S., Central Connecticut State College,
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts
Directed by: Professor George Forman

The purposes of this study were to identify the need for a systematic moral development curriculum, to develop a theoretical basis on which to base the curriculum, to design a prototype of an in-service training program for teachers, to implement the program, and to evaluate the impact of the program on children.

A review of the literature was conducted and an in-service program was developed based on the organismic view of development of Youniss and Jordan which addresses cognitive, affective, and volitional processes. The cognitive developmental theory of Piaget and other theoriticians were incorporated into a curriculum for the in-service program. This curriculum was used as the basis for the four one-hour in-servce sessions presented to kindergarten through fourth grade teachers in a public

school system during one school year.

The evaluation format for this study included an assessment of the in-service program and a pretest and posttest matched group design for measuring the growth of moral development of children.

Cooperation was defined as the operational definition for moral development. An activity of building a card house was chosen as the environmental situation to observe children working and interacting together. Four behavioral areas were identified to assess the occurrence of specific behaviors among children: destructive toward house, constructive toward house, non-cooperative toward others, and cooperative toward others.

A second evaluation component had students respond to several of Piaget's situations to determine the stage of development of that child. This was conducted as a post comparision between members of the experimental and control groups. In addition, the teachers of these selected students completed a teacher rating scale to assess the actual behavior of the student as perceived by their teacher.

The results from this study did not support the hypothesis that an in-service program would have a significant impact on the moral develpment of children. The rationale for the lack of significant findings and

ideas for future research in this area are presented. Suggested changes in the in-service program and the evaluation design are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

C H A P T E R I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A curriculum for the moral development of children is a contemporary issue in public education, although by no means a new one. In the 1800's, much of the teaching in public education had moral instruction interwoven throughout everyday lessons. The McGuffy Reader, a primary reader at the time, had moral issues as an underlying theme in reading instruction. The following excerpt is taken from an 1857 McGuffy Reader: "The little boy took care of his faithful dog as long as he lived and never forgot that we must do good to others, if we wish them to do the same to us."

The trend of public education over the past several decades has been to avoid dealing with moral education as a part of the curriculum (Taylor and Oliver, 1972). The rationale for this avoidance was based on a lack of agreement as to what moral concepts or values should be taught. Issues surrounding separation of church and state brought about prohibition of teaching any set of values that might have a particular religious foundation. The issue of teaching values brought to light visions of the indoctrination in World War II that lead to the extermination of millions of people. This raised considerable opposition to values teaching.

With the coming of high technology and the age of Sputnik there was a major thrust to improve academics, especially mathematics and science, thereby placing less importance on moral education.

Many of these issues had impact on the exclusion of a moral education curriculum in public schools - an exclusion that continues to prevail today. Although this was the state of the art in public education, a few developmentalists did address moral development in conjunction with child development. Jean Piaget wrote his classic book in 1932, The Moral Judgement of the Child. Although Piaget did little to expand this work, it did provide the foundation for many developmental theorists who followed him. Lawrence Kohlberg did extensive work in the area of moral reasoning, most of which was done outside of public education. His work spanned 25 years and has been a concept adopted by other cognitive-stage theorists. However, little work has been done in public education to implement and evaluate the impact of his model on children.

Public schools often took no position on moral education. There was no explicit curriculum worked out that addressed values or values teaching within the schools. The implicit curriculum was often based on the concept that a structured environment can provide a moral education for children. Kohlberg (1973), who felt that a

child's behavior can be shaped by immediate repetition and elaboration of the correct responses and by use of immediate feedback or reward, believed that addressing moral reasoning of children required direct challenging of their thinking. The concepts implicit in the curriculum were those of the current educational psychologists of the time who espoused learning theory, i.e., Hull, Skinner, and Bandura.

Institutions of higher education were also affected by the lack of focus on moral education, both in their efforts to research the subject and in providing course work for teachers. Little research was being conducted to assess the origins of moral development. Teacher training institutions had few offerings to address the moral development of children. Only those individuals in early childhood education received training in developmental theories that included social and moral development.

The lack of formalized training programs in moral education for prospective teachers has had a major impact on two areas of public education. First, there is no general curriculum plan in school systems that outlines goals and objectives for a moral education curriculum. Because of their lack of training, teachers do not have the necessary background to identify this as an area of concern. Secondly, there is no systematic approach by

teachers for implementing specific teaching strategies and techniques in the area of moral education. Teachers usually address behaviors within their classrooms in the same manner that was used when they were in school since no alternative methods have been presented to them. The effect on children is that individual teachers may handle similar situations very differently. Children are left to interpret the inconsistencies between teachers while also trying to integrate home and school influences. Often the result is confusion for the child; confusion for a child without the opportunity to sort out and understand the inconsistencies is not helpful for moral learning. Clarification of these inconsistencies is exactly what is needed for children to understand moral issues.

In the past decade, there has been renewed interest in the moral development of children by theorists, educators, and the public in general. Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory has gained recognition by private and public sectors. Theorists have begun conducting studies to look more closely at cognition as the basis for moral development. Criminal institutions have worked directly with Kohlberg in an attempt to rehabilitate people who have been incarcerated. Sidney Simon (1978) introduced 'values clarification' techniques that have gained popularity on college campuses, especially in the areas of psychology and

counseling.

The public has expressed a very strong concern about the need for moral education as a part of the educational curricula. In the 1980 Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools, 84% of public school parents favored instruction that would deal with morals and moral behavior. Again in 1981, 73% favored values instruction in their schools. Also in 1981, the public was asked to voice their opinion about the amount of attention they felt was being given to six educational objectives in public education. As stated in the poll results, "Most studies dealing with the goals of education reveal that the public expects the public schools to assume responsibilities that in the past have been borne by the home and the church." The educational objective, "Developing students' moral and ethical character," was rated as number one by 64% of public school parents as not being given enough attention. This strong opinion, and on-going research in moral development, has brought about little change in public education toward addressing moral development as a curricular issue.

Problem Statement

Children in public schools are being denied an opportunity to benefit from a systematic moral development

curriculum. This has occurred because most public schools have no educational model on which to base a moral development curriculum. Most public schools do not have a theoretical framework for their educational program from which a moral development curriculum could be established. The lack of this curriculum may be one reason that there has been an increase in private and religious school enrollment. Estimates of non-public school attendance have risen since 1975 from seven percent to over ten to twelve percent (Brooks, 1982). Because these schools can articulate a moral curriculum, parents have a choice of the moral education their children receive. The previously mentioned Gallop Poll results also indicated support for this movement to non-public school settings.

Public schools have avoided addressing the issue of moral development since concerns were raised regarding the teaching of 'values.' Questions of 'what' values were to be taught and 'how' children were to be instructed in moral education raised the broader issues of separation of church and state which were issues public educators chose to keep away from.

It is the author's opinion that moral issues and the teaching of values should be taught and, in fact, are being taught in our public schools. John Dewey (1934), a dominant figure in American education during the first half

of this century, believed moral education to be a primary focus of the schools. He stated that, "the child's moral character must develop in a natural, just, and social atmosphere. The school should provide this environment for its part in the child's moral development (p. 85)." The teaching of values in our schools is presently occurring because man, by his nature, is a moral individual who needs to learn to develop moral skills to live in our society as a contributing member. The first society, outside of the family, that children are exposed to and need to learn to function within, is the school environment. Values are presently being taught in our schools by nature of the rules and regulations imposed on children. These rules and regulations imply the rights and wrongs within the schools, yet no moral curriculum for the basis of the standards set have been made explicit. The school environment is an ideal setting for moral instruction to take place. It is necessary for schools to develop a systematic curriculum based on a theoretical model that has been developed from a philosophy based on the nature of man.

Teachers have not insisted upon a moral development curriculum because of the issues stated above and because of their lack of formal training in this area. Teacher training institutions have failed to offer courses in this field while schools have failed to provide in-service

training for their current staff. The failure to provide in-service training for teachers reinforces the apprehensions of teachers in addressing moral education, and therefore inhibits them from pursuing the need for a systematic curriculum as they encounter moral issues on a daily basis.

The necessity for establishing a moral development curriculum becomes more critical as school systems continue to overlook its exclusion year after year. Many systems continue to function with little response to the issues of moral development. Those that have seen a need to establish a curriculum have only theories from which to choose. The author has found little empirical data supporting an emerging developmentalist view of moral education which has been field tested in a naturalistic setting. The question of whether or not an in-service teacher training program in moral development based on a systematic curriculum can have positive impact on children has yet to be answered.

Background

The importance of addressing the problem of the lack of trained teachers in the area of moral development based on a sytematic curriculum becomes quite clear as one looks at the impact on children. This impact, as described

below, is then transferred to the society at large when the children become adults and begin to function as individual members of the society.

The major impact of not having teachers trained in a systematic moral development curriculum is that children are not afforded the opportunity to develop their skills in the moral area within the schools except by the preference of individual teachers. These teachers, having not been trained to be watchful for incidences in the classroom involving moral skills, will often miss the most effective and ideal times for fostering moral development. The environment of the classroom, and of the school as a whole, exists as a microcosm of the larger society where these children will soon be functioning. Every opportunity to enhance the moral development of children could be taken advantage of if teachers had specific training in this area.

Another consequence of not having teachers trained in moral development is that many inconsistencies occur in the classroom and school building in dealing with moral issues. Even though many teachers are reluctant to talk about moral education, let alone able to identify their own 'internal' moral curriculum, most would agree that, implicitly, moral education is being addressed by the rules, regulations and expectations set upon students.

Within the school, there are underlying rules that state expected behavior of the children as they interact with peers and teachers. Within each classroom there is usually another set of rules enforced by the individual teacher. The individual rules and regulations may differ from those of the school with varying consequences to both positive and negative behaviors. An example that may clarify these inconsistencies is as follows: A child tells the teacher that he saw another student take something that didn't belong to him. The teacher tells the child that tattling is not allowed. In this situation the child is reprimanded for saying something about an unjust event. This leads to confusion for the child, especially when another teacher responds very differently to the child in a similar situation. The second teacher responds by saying that incidents will only be dealt with if they are seen by the teacher; while a third teacher thanks the child for his concern and tells him that the matter will be dealt with at an appropriate time. These are inconsistencies that lead to confusion for the child, when for the child it is most important that things be addressed in a fair manner. By having teachers understand the moral development of children, stategies and techniques can be employed to enhance the moral learning of the child.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify the need for a systematic moral development curriculum, establish a theoretical basis on which the curriculum could be developed, design a prototype for an in-service teacher training program, implement the program, and evaluate the impact of the program on children.

There were three major components of the study. First, a prototype of an in-service program was developed and implemented. The in-service program was based on a theoretical framework established in the review of the literature. It was implemented in a public school setting at the elementary level. The focus of the sessions was to develop teacher understanding of the concepts that underlie moral development and to provide teachers with strategies and techniques for implementation of these concepts. The second component of the study was the teacher evaluation of the in-service program. A questionnaire was completed by each participant of the in-service program to assess the impact the sessions had on the techniques and strategies teachers use for fostering moral development. The third component of the study was the evaluation of the impact the teacher in-service program had on the students. Students were randomly selected to participate in a pretest and posttest matched group evaluation design used to assess

their interactions during a specified activity. Several of these students were also asked to complete an examiner administered developmental rating scale. In addition, teachers were asked to complete a teacher rating scale for specific students. This gave comparative data between the experimental and control groups.

Outline of Dissertation

This first chapter of this dissertation described the rationale and purpose for this study. The identification of the need for a systematic moral development curriculum was presented and supported. In Chapter 2, a review of the literature describes and critiques many contemporary theories on moral development. Based on the review of the literature, a rationale for the use of a theoretical model based on an organismic view of development is presented as a prototype of a teacher training in-service program. The outline of this program, based on goals and objectives, is described in Chapter 3. The evaluation design used to assess the impact of the in-service program on children is presented in detail. In Chapter 4, the results of the study are presented and analyzed. Finally, Chapter 5 gives a summary of the findings and sets forth the implications of the study and a direction for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to review and critique the literature on moral development and to establish a theoretical basis for an in-service program for teachers in a public school setting. The in-service program reflects the organization of contemporary theories into a model that is coherent and comprehensive, and based on an organismic theory of development.

There were several contemporary theories on moral development found although no curriculum for an in-service program was located. One reason for the lack of a curriculum was found to be the manner in which schools often interpreted their role as an educational system. They saw their role as primarily teaching academics, a view of providing only intellectual training with moral training being largely ignored. Porter and Taylor (1972) stated that, "the narrow concepts of morality resulted in the expunging of any explicit moral teaching (which was conceived of a religious training and character development and more properly the domain of the home) and led to a vacuum in the schools (p. 1)." Schools often took the 'bag of virtues' approach of honesty, friendliness, trust, and the like, and provided little instruction on moral development.

Contrary to the position of the schools, there is a public concern for the teaching of moral development within the schools. The 1980 and 1981 Gallup Polls have shown that four out of five parents would prefer to have the teaching of values occurring within the schools. In an editorial, Barman (1982) suggested the implications of not having a curriculum in moral development in our schools. He stated that, "generally, education has divorced itself from moral issues in the curriculum. Instead, our educational system has advocated a very authoritarian policy and has thereby left little room for students to question and discuss moral issues (p. 177)."

Although a curriculum in moral development was not located in the literature review, comtemporary theorists are conducting research in the area of moral development of children. A historical perspective on learning theory was first presented to make explicit the reason for the developmentalist's viewpoint which was chosen as the theoretical basis for the in-service program. Several developmental theories were then critiqued showing the differing viewpoints of each. An organismic theory of development was then presented with conclusions being stated for the rationale for the development of the in-service program. A summary of the chapter follows the conclusions.

Learning Theory

Learning theory has had a long history from which two basic theories have developed: associationism and functionalism. Associationism stresses the connections made between environmental events and behavior. Functionalism is more concerned with the function that behavior serves.

Associationism is represented by the work of Pavlov and Guthrie. Pavlov directed his research to the conditioned response of animals. The conditioning of a desired response to a particular stimuli was developed based on the theory that associations among different stimuli could be made. An animal could be conditioned to salivate upon the ringing of a bell. The association from food to the bell had been accomplished. Guthrie's theory varied from Pavlov's in that he believed that the association made did not occur between the food and the bell but between the bell and the salivating. In both instances, the importance of this research was the ability to condition a response to obtain a desired behavior.

Functionalism is represented by the work of James and Munsterburg. Functionalists wanted to know how the mind works and what uses the mind has. James remained more a philosopher than a practitioner. He believed mind and body are not two different interacting systems, but are

different aspects of the same experience. Munsterberg formulated his 'action theory' which was described by Murphy and Kovach (1972). Action theory holds to the belief that, "...when the stimulation of a sense organ leads to a conscious event and a motor response, the sensation arises not in connection with the mere excitement of a sensory area of the brain, but with the passage of the neural impulse from sensory to motor regions."

The view of the functionalists in connecting the response to the function of the mind, sets the groundwork for the behavioristic approach and the development of reinforcement theory. The behavioristic approach is well represented by the work of Hull, Tolman, Skinner, and Bandura. Hull's theory considered the classical conditioning of Pavlov and Guthrie but included instrumental conditioning. Instrumental conditioning emphasized reinforcment as a determining factor of behavior change. It was based on the hypothesis that learning is a gradual process, not a sudden, insightful one. From his research, Hull derived several propositions regarding reinforcement and learning that set the framework for other theorists. The concept of an intervening variable was critical to his theory.

Tolman introduced the use of intervening variables in learning theory. The intervening variable represents an

inferred organismic process that intervenes between a stimulus and a response. A major contribution of Tolman was his interpretation of behavior as purposive. Piaget and Jordan hold to the interpertation that behavior is purposive. Piaget discusses this as part of his mediated learning. Jordan emphasizes purpose or 'subjective aim' as the primary force that gives man direction in learning.

Operant theory is a learning theory primarily identified with Skinner. Skinner's systematic approach to behaviorism was referred to as experimental analysis of behavior. He observed that behavior could be clustered together into respondent and operant behaviors. Respondent behaviors are those behaviors elicited by a stimulus, often referred to as reflexive behaviors. Other behaviors occur because of past consequences that were the result of the response. These are referred to as operant behaviors. The significance of the clusters of behavior was that operant behaviors could be changed by modifying the consequence to that behavior.

Skinner established nine propositions which define his theory based on operant conditioning. The underlying concept was that the consequence to a behavior is the element that is critical for behavior change. Skinner established reinforcement and punishment propositions that set the foundation for behavior modification techniques and

their application to changing human behavior. This approach became known as applied behavior analysis.

The systematic recording procedures Skinner developed brought his theory closer to a science than had been previously accomplished. The development of the Skinner box made his observations of animals unaffected by arbitrary behaviors of the subject. These two factors together have had a major impact on behavior modification techniques and their use in education today. The use of behavior modification techniques addresses the issue of 'what is,' but does not deal with 'what ought to be.'

Bandura's work centered on the effects of the modeling of behavior. He was concerned with how people learn new responses in social situations. His work dealt with the acquisition of new responses through observational learning, and the roles novelty, capacity, selectivity, and motivation play in this learning.

Developmental Theory

Developmental theory emerged primarily because of the static view learning theory adheres to. Learning theory does not address change over time but views behaviors as a cross-section at any particular time. This "mechanistic model" of learning makes connections between elements that do not change. It deals only with the 'what is' issue.

The developmental theory of learning views change as the basic premise upon which learning occurs. Learning is seen as a patterned and sequential process that unfolds over time. The process that occurs is internal to the individual. Developmentalists see moral development as occurring within the individual primarily in the cognitive, affective, and volitional process areas. The 'values' or 'what ought to be' issues are addressed in developmental theories. One theorist in particular, Jean Piaget, was a pioneer in the field of developmental theory.

In the early 1930's, Piaget began establishing a framework for cognitive stage development that has spanned the century. Piaget's theory places the origin of development of cognition with the child mediating his learning as he interacts with the environment. In the mid-1950's, Lawrence Kohlberg derived a cognitive stage theory of moral development which was heavily influenced by the work of Piaget. Kohlberg's work places the origin of moral development in cognition.

Until recently, there was little challenge of Piaget's and Kohlberg's formulation of moral development. Piaget is an international name synonymous with child development, as is Kohlberg in the field of moral development. The major challenge to these two prominent educators is with their insistence that cognition is the origin of all learning.

Other educators (Blasi, 1980; Locke, 1983; Youniss, 1981; Jordan, 1973) who have challenged Piaget and Kohlberg continue to draw exception both theoretically and empirically to the cognitive stage development theory. The theoretical basis espoused by these theorists is that cognition alone is not the origin of development but that other factors, primarily affectivity and intention or volition, play a significant role in moral development.

Cognitive Stage Development Theory

The primary view of the cognitive developmentalists is that cognition is the origin of child development, specifically moral development. This view does not rule out the existence of other factors such as affectivity or motivation which may have a bearing on development. It sets forth the proposition that child development is founded in the intellectual functions of the child.

Piaget (1932) was a pioneer in establishing a connection between cognitive development and moral development. In his book, The Moral Judgement of the Child, he stated that moral judgment must follow approximately the same developmental patterns as does intellectual development. It was not until years later that he was able to clearly define the intellectual stages of development. Nearly forty years later, Piaget had not

changed his original concept although his thinking linked moral judgment much more closely with the concrete operations of thought. As Gruber and Voneche (1977) state in their anthology of Piaget, "...the leading concept is the growth of intellectual operation rather than the growth of socialization." Piaget saw the child as becoming more and more rational, not as a direct result of development, but through the child's interplay with other people in his environment. Gruber and Voneche (1977) further clarified this when they stated that "...the main line of Piaget's position is to insist that thoughts grow through action, but at the same time that actions of a given stage are determined by the intellectual level then achieved by the child." The reference made here to "stage" requires further clarification. Piaget asserts that a child develops in stages. As a stage is attained, the child develops equilibrium. As the child encounters anomolies or events that no longer make sense, a state of dis-equilibrium begins. As the child develops intellectually and is better able to interpret these events, a new stage is attained and the child again develops equilibrium. Piaget is also insistent, as outlined by Gruber and Voneche (1977), that stages occur in a constant order; that they are universal, able to be repeated under widely differing circumstances; that they

are orderly, corresponding in some way to another sequence which is deemed orderly; that they are stable, having the same characteristics being exhibited over a period of time; and that they demonstrate coherence, showing the same underlying logic in widely differing tasks.

In applying this to moral development, Piaget would view the child's moral judgment as being determined by his intellectual level of development. The moral judgment would not progress until a higher stage of intellectual development was attained.

Piaget (1932) established that there is a link between morality and intellect. He contended that there are two types of morality in child development. The first type is constraint, which is placed upon the child by adults. This constraint leads to heteronomy. The second type of morality is cooperation, which occurs between children and leads to autonomy. The transition between constraint and cooperation is seen as a time when the child internalizes and generalizes rules and commands.

Heteronomy is viewed as being a combination of affection and fear. The perception of the child is that he is inferior to a superior person, usually an adult. In this relationship the child accepts the orders of the adult, internalizing them as a sense of duty. Piaget (1932) uses the term 'moral realism' to describe the

consequence of heteronomy. Gruber and Voneche (1977) define moral realism as a "systematic structure that is preoperatory both with reference to the relational cognitive mechanisms and to the process of socialization."

Moral realism has three basic components. First, it sees duty as essentially heteronomous; it demands that the letter rather than the spirit of the law be observed, and it induces an objective concept of responsibility. When we speak of duty, the child is seen as developing the concept of obligation and the necessity to do what he has been asked because it is asked by an adult. There is no question as to the reason for the request and it becomes imperative on the part of the child that the request be fulfilled. Second, following the letter of the law rather than the spirit of the law is derived from the sense of duty and obligation. What was asked, must be done. A rule sets up what the adult wants and therefore it is followed. The importance of 'why' does not exist, providing little understanding about the intent of the request. Third, objective responsibility evolves out of issues of clumsiness, stealing, and lying on the part of the child. These factors play important roles in the development of morality. For example, the child views clumsiness as important primarily because of the adult reaction to the occurrence of it. Often this reaction is more severe based

on the quantity of items the child breaks and not on the intent under which the clumsiness occurred. This then translates to the concept of lying. Children are unable to understand the intent of a lie, but look primarily at the consequence resulting from the lie. Two distinct moral attitudes are present, one that judges moral actions according to their material consequences, and one that takes intention into account.

Autonomy is the result of genuine cooperation within a social environment and freedom from adult constraint. The child is able to make judgments on rules or laws and to change them with democratic consent. The new relationship with peers that is established is that of mutual respect. The child moves from the bond of doing what he is told, to choosing what to do based on right and wrong. The result of the new level of development is the idea of justice in the child. Piaget (1932) in discussing some of the difficulty in explaining autonomy states:

> ...if the affective aspect of cooperation and reciprocity (mutual respect) eludes interrogation, there is one notion, probably the most rational of all moral notions, which seems to be the direct result of cooperation and of which the analysis can be attempted without encountering too much difficulty - we mean the notion of justice (p. 197-198).

The idea of justice is developed from mutual respect and reciprocity. The child is not bound by adult

constraint, but is guided by what is fair. Fairness in the eyes of the child is relative to his developmental period. Piaget has outlined three periods in the development of justice of the child. The first period of justice lasts until the age of 7-8 years where the child believes that adult authority is superior to what is fair or unfair. In the second period between the ages of 8-10 years, the child develops a sense of justice, being that which is equal. The final period is that which takes into account equity, which has impact on the decision of what is fair or unfair.

Piaget (1932) sums up the idea of justice along with the concept that it develops very independently of adult modeling. He states:

> The conclusion which we shall finally reach is that the sense of justice, though naturally capable of being reinforced by the precepts and potential example of the adult, is largely independent of these influences, and requires nothing more for its development than the mutual respect and solidarity which holds among children themselves. It is often at the expense of the adult and not because of him that the notions of just and unjust find their way into youthful minds (p. 198).

Borrowing heavily from the work of Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg began work in the mid-1950's in the area of moral development. Using Piaget's sequential stage development concept, Kohlberg, in an effort to determine how children resolve conflicts in their observation of differing

situations, began research on moral reasoning. He developed situations in which a 'moral dilemma' was set up. These dilemmas were followed by a series of questions to ask the child and focused on the issue of right or wrong. Based on many years of research and following the tradition of Piaget, Kohlberg established a concept of stages of cognitive development which refers to the structure of one's reasoning. Kohlberg and Hersh (1977) stated the following characteristics in regard to stage development:

1. Stages are "structured wholes," or organized systems of thought. This means individuals are consistent in their level of moral judgments.
2. Stages form an invariant sequence. Under all conditions except trauma, movement is always forward, never backward. Individuals never skip stages, and movement is always to the next stage up. This is true in all cultures.
3. Stages are "hierarchical integration." Thinking at a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower stage thinking. There is a tendency to function at, or prefer, the highest level available (p. 54).

The stages of moral development which Kohlberg has established tap the individual's reasoning or moral thinking in regard to a situation. A situation, whose purpose is raising moral issues such as right or wrong and just or unjust, is presented as a dilemma. The response given by

the individual determines his stage of moral development. The proposition held by Kohlberg is that once the stage of moral development is determined, exposure to the next higher level of reasoning will move that individual to that next higher stage. Hence, we have Kohlberg's cognitive stage development theory. The following description, presented by Kohlberg and Hersh (1977), defines the characteristics of the stages of moral development:

> Preconventional Level - At this level, the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good or bad, right or wrong, but interprets these labels either in terms of the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. The level is divided into the following two stages:
>
> Stage 1: The punishment-and-obedience orientation.
> Stage 2: The instrumental-relativist orientation.
>
> Conventional Level - At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting,and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. At this level, there are the following two stages:
>
> Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy - nice girl" orientation.
> Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation.

Postconventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level - At this level, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. This level also has two stages:
Stage 5: The social-contract legalistic orientation.
Stage 6: The universal-ethical-principle orientation.

There are other contemporary theorists who support cognitive stage development theory. Although these theorists hold to the proposition that moral development originates in cognition, the introduction of new variables does not change the theoretical underpinnings, but conceptualizes aspects of the theory differently. For example, Nucci (1982) is in agreement with Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory as the basis for moral development although he suggests that Kohlberg's theory is limiting since it does not make a distinction between morality and social convention. Nucci feels that morality and social convention are organized out of distinctly different developmental patterns. Morality is derived from an individual's conceptualization of justice while social convention is "behavioral uniformities which coordinate the actions of individuals participating in a social system."

In an article relating to values instruction, Nucci

(1981) elaborates on the curriculum for values teaching. He again makes a distinction between morality and social convention, seeing each as requiring different approaches in instruction. He states:

> the pedagogical corollary of (that) proposal is that the form of individual/environmental interaction occurring in the context of values instruction be coordinated with the domain of the 'lesson.' This implies that the content presented to the student, as well as the nature of teacher instructions and classroom instructions, be appropriate for the domain of the topics or issues under consideration (p. 491).

Damon has also adapted cognitive stage theory, constructing an index of moral reasoning called Damon's positive-justice interview. This interview, as explained by Damon and Killen (1982), is an index of an ordered six-step sequence that describes the development of children's reasoning about sharing, fairness, and distributive justice. This index is used to determine the level of the child's moral reasoning, being similar to Kohlberg's sequence. In a study conducted by Damon and Killen (1982) using the positive-justice interview, peer interaction was found to have influence on 78% of the children participating in the study. Damon and Killen state:

> Peer relation is special because cooperation and mutuality of intent are more likely in

> an equal than in a nonequal relation. Cooperation and mutuality provide an optimal atmosphere for the acquisition of moral concepts like justice, kindness, and concern for another's welfare (p.348).

The importance of cooperation and mutuality in developing moral concepts have been clearly stated by Damon and Killen. They also mention the affective and volitional components of development, kindness, and intent, although their role is not elaborated on.

Affective and Volitional Components of Stage Development

Much controversy has been raised in recent years in regards to Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory and cognitive developmental theory in general. Critics have challenged the basic assumption that moral development is rooted in cognition. Instead, complex structures involving other aspects of psychological development are seen as the basis of moral development. From this view, the child is seen as reacting to the needs of the subject in Kohlberg's moral dilemmas, not from their cognitive developmental level. The critics feel that rational deduction does not occur as the primary incentive for making decisions, but that decisions of justice are based in the affectivity of the subject, i.e., empathy, sympathy, concern for others, and responsibility. Candee (1976) found that people at higher

levels of moral reasoning more often consistently chose alternatives focusing on human rights over those focusing on convention. Henry (1983), in a theoretical perspective on the psychological study of moral development, presents research findings that support the view that "...it is the pattern of identification which gives rise to moral structure, rather than the development of reasoning abilities." Peisach and Hardeman (1983) found that contrary to expectations, approximately three quarters of first graders' responses to questions designed to elicit reasons for not lying and stealing were at a stage three. The expectation was that the majority of third graders would respond at stage one or two. In this study, a distinction was made between stereotypic and non-stereotypic stage three responses. Peisach and Hardeman found that approximately 40% of the stage three responses were non-stereotypic and involved concern with social approval, not harming others, and preservation of social relations.

The major opposing view to the cognitive developmentalists is that moral cognition does not lead an individual to moral action. The supporters of this view do not disclaim the importance of cognition as a component of morality; they assert that moral behavior involves a much more complex set of structures, placing a priority on the

affectivity and motivation of an individual. Locke (1983), for example, has outlined a three step model of the structure of moral development which includes 'form of moral reasoning,' and 'specific moral judgments' being influenced by 'other factors.' He feels that moral reasoning is only a part of moral development and that the major component is what he terms 'other factors' which influence an individual's reasoning, judgment, and behavior. In fact, Locke (1983) states that moral reasoning and moral judgment may be unimportant: "...the major influences on both behavior and moral judgments may well belong among these 'other factors,' and be largely non-cognitive in nature." Locke speculates on the structure of what those other factors may be. He feels we need to ask the question, "What are the determinants of behavior classified as, moral or immoral?" He also suggests that cognition or moral reasoning may be a result of our behaviors and that cognition may be mediated through affective or motivational factors.

In a critical review of the literature, Blasi (1980) has also taken the position that moral action is much more complex than moral cognition and that it involves an affective element. He cites the fact that the literature does point to the relationship between cognition and behavior. Blasi views moral actions as functional

relations among processes from various domains. He speaks of the perceptual domain as influencing moral action, and has placed a great emphasis on the motivational and affective processes of an individual which play a vital role in moral development. He feels that moral actions are "...a response that is derived from understanding and reasoning concerning both the fundamental goals of human beings and the means to pursue them." The process approach to moral action that Blasi speaks of focuses on discovering the relations of the processes that make up moral action. Moral action would need to be viewed not in terms of the traits that make an individual moral but in terms of the 'personal consistency' one exhibits and how the processes are integrated to make up moral action.

In conclusion, Blasi states that what he feels is needed is a "...direct focus on the processes and skills involved in the capacity to invest one's life with the meanings that are personally understood and accepted and to act in ways that are consistent with one's normal insights (p. 40)."

Organismic View of Development

Cognitive developmentalists have had a major influence on research with their theory that moral development originates in cognition. Many contemporary theorists

(Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Damon & Killen, 1982) have adopted this cognitive view and have proceeded to conduct research in this area. Other theorists (Blasi, 1980; Henry, 1983; Candee, 1976; Peisach & Hardeman, 1983) have placed the primary source of moral development in the affective domain and have some research support for this thesis.

Another view that has emerged in recent years is an organismic view of development held by Youniss (1978) and Jordan (1972) which establishes moral development as the result of an interactive process between individuals. This view takes a broader perspective in establishing moral development as an integration of complex interactions that occur as a child interacts in his environment.

An organismic view of development is a broad perspective of development based on the nature of man. This perspective takes into account cognitive, affective, and volitional theories of development. It holds that there is an integrative process that occurs that emphasizes the role each theory plays in the moral development of an individual.

Youniss has established a 'relations theory' which views the child as a part of a system that mediates interactions with his environment. These interactions are the basis for the formation of moral development. Youniss

has stated:

> ...social or moral knowledge is constructed by the subject in collaboration with other subjects insofar as they interact with the subject. The social context, meaning specifically interpersonal relations, is the originating source of knowledge. The topic of thought is at first interpersonal interactions, and later, relations in which interactions are organized in rule systems. Relations in turn are the source of concepts of persons, including the self and others (p. 235).

The view that Youniss holds is cybernetic in nature. Reciprocity is seen as the basis for the development of relations, the consequences of which are the outcomes of the reciprocity, not the constraint placed upon the child by the adult. Youniss states that "...the self radically modifies the other's idea both by interacting with other and by reconstructing it for self along with the other."

Developmentally, reciprocity occurs at two levels: symmetrical and cooperative. Symmetrical reciprocity refers to acts that will probably occur one for one. One child does something and the other, in return, does something similar, either positive or negative in nature. In another situation a stalemate may occur because one child makes a statement, the other makes a statement in return, and there is no change in either behavior. This type of interaction occurs in children of ages 6 to 8,

which means that friendships developed during this age group may be short lived because of the types of relations occurring.

Cooperative reciprocity, which usually occurs in children older than 8 years of age, is based on peers voluntarily agreeing to participate in a new relationship. This relationship or interaction is different from symmetrical reciprocity in that children can have a time delay in responding or needing a response. A child can adhere to a request or opinion of another and follow that request with no need for immediate response from that individual. Often the reciprocal event may take another form, because the child understands the strengths and weaknesses of the other.

An organismic view of development is also held by Jordan. He has expanded on aspects of the previously presented theories and has encompassed them in the ANISA Model. Jordan's (1972) view of development is similar to the stage theory of Piaget but does not present development as originating in cognition. Instead, Jordan takes an organismic view of development, following the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead. Whitehead (1978) espouses an organismic view of nature holding to the evolutionary process of man as the basis for development. Jordan has

that is based on a philosophy of change.

Jordan and Streets (1973), in developing the ANISA Model, have been proponents of an integrative model of stage development. They see all aspects of biological and psychological potential being brought to bear as the child interacts in his environments. Moral development in the ANISA Model is referred to as a higher order competency, which is an integration of these potentialities. As Locke (1983) has pointed out, motivation and affectivity affect judgment. Jordan's ANISA Model is built on the organismic view of development of the higher order competencies, of which justice is the ideal. Both Piaget and Kohlberg also view justice as the ideal of moral development. Youniss (1983) elaborated on the concept of justice. He states:

> ...democracy necessitates individual expression of will and readiness to subject self to the majority. When either requirement is weakened, decision making passes to selected groups who then may demand adherence to their position. It is sometimes stated that the guard against such a result is moral principle or a sense of justice (p. 225).

Cooperation is the interactive process that establishes justice as the ideal and is essential for its establishment.

The ANISA Model sets forth two basic classes of potentiality: biological and psychological. Biological

development unfolds as cells multiply, are differentiated, and then are integrated into particular body parts such as tissues and organs. The key to releasing biological potential is nutrition. Psychological development occurs as an individual interacts within his environment with experiences being differentiated, integrated, and generalized. Psychological potential is organized in five categories: psychomotor, perceptual, cognitive, affective, and volitional, and is released through learning. Learning is viewed in a very similar manner to Piaget's theory. In Piaget's view, learning experiences are assimilated and accommodated, as equilibrium is established. In the ANISA Model, learning is the differentiation, integration, and generalization of experience. They are the attributes of a single stage in the expression of psychological potentialities. Kalinowski and Jordan (1973) state that;

> 'differentation is the ability to break down experience, whether internal or external, into separate contrastable elements. Integration is the ability to combine those elements in a new way thereby providing new information, new feelings, new skills, and new perceptions which may or may not become expressed immediately in some form of overt behavior. Generalization is the ability to utilize that recombination on other situations. Through these processes potentiality is translated into actuality, and another stage is negotiated. Control over them constitutes learning competence (p. 23)."

This definition of learning gives the perspective that there is a total integration of the different processes within the individual as learning takes place. Feelings, thoughts, and volition are all aspects of learning, whether internal or external, a view that is organismic in nature.

Another concept of the ANISA Model that is similar to that of Piaget is the developmental scheme. Piaget holds that development occurs in a sequential and invariant manner. Kalinowski and Jordan (1973) state that an underlying concept of the ANISA Theory of Development is that learning takes place in an ordered and sequential manner and that there is a timing, unique to each individual, which is essential to growth and change.

Development, which unfolds in a sequence, is defined by Kalinowski and Jordan (1973) as "...the order of those changes in an organism that yields relatively permanent but novel increments not only in its structure but in its modes of functioning as well." The changes involve ordered movement through successive stages, i.e., stage development. Kalinowski and Jordan (1973) view a stage as "...a section of a developmental sequence circumscribing a basic unit of change in an organism." They go on to say that a stage is the basic unit of change that occurs as the potentiality of an individual is actualized, each of which "...presupposes its antecedent and is in turn a

prerequisite to its successor."

The organismic view of the ANISA Model is broader than that of the cognitive stage theorists and of the affective theorists. It incorporates into its conceptual framework of moral development the thinking of Youniss. Youniss holds to a theory of relations which takes into account an interaction of cognition and affect. The ANISA Model sets forth a concept of moral development that is the result of an integration of all biological and psychological potential of an individual. This integrative process occurs as the individual interacts with his environments. The primary psychological potentialities brought to bear in relation to moral development are the cognitive, affective, and volitional aspects of development.

Conclusion

The literature review in this chapter critiqued learning and developmental theories. The major differences in their approaches come from the definition of learning. Learning theorists see learning as a process external to the individual, one that comes from a stimulus or the result of a reinforcer. Developmentalists see learning occurring from processes that take place within the individual. Learning theorists measure learning as a rate in change resulting from external stimuli.

Developmentalists see learning as occurring over time, in an ordered and sequential manner. An issue that is also raised is the 'determinants of learning.' Learning theorists emphasize events occurring in the environment as determinants whereas developmentalists see the external environment only as a source on knowledge. In a discussion on Piaget, Forman (1980) stated that, "there are things that the developing child learns that cannot be accounted for by only physical, social, and maturational determinants. Piaget terms this determinant 'equilibration' (p. 254)." Equilibration is an internal process that helps to mediate internal and external events.

A final issue that distinguishes learning theorists from developmentalists relates to change. Learning theorists look at events that control behavior and use this to predict and explain the behavior. Forman (1980) stated that developmentalists explain behavior by "observing its structure and its development across a period of several years. A description of the process of change constitutes an explanation (p. 254)."

With these dinstinctions made, it becomes clear that a moral development curriculum needs to be based on a developmental theory. Learning theory would dictate that rewards and punishments be established for moral behaviors or that model of moral behavior by adults is an adequate

approach to moral development. Developmental theory looks at change over time and would focus on the internal processes of individuals as an approach to moral development. The external environment becomes a source of experiences which are used to develop the internal processes.

The issue of which developmental theory is the correct theory to use as a theoretical basis to a moral development curriculum is now raised. Several developmental theories were presented that encompassed many different aspects of moral development. Piaget, Kohlberg, and Damon and Killen present a strong position for cognitive developmental theory as the basis for learning. Extensive research has shown that children who are introduced to higher stages of cognitive reasoning,attain that level of reasoning. Yet, questions are raised by Blasi, Henry, Candee, and Persach and Hardeman regarding the importance of moral reasoning and moral judgment. These theorists have found that affectivity plays a critical role in moral behavior.

The organismic view of development held by Youniss and Jordan encompasses the concepts of the previously mentioned theorists. They feel that moral development is a result of an interaction of cognitive, affective, and volitional development. Youniss (1981) stated that;

> ...psychologists need not choose between a cognitive or affective approach to the study of moral development. There is an alternative which, in principle, integrates both sides. It comes from a redefinition of the individual as a subject within communicative relations. It is through these relations that knowledge is socially constructed in procedures of communication which serve the function of reasoning. By participating in these procedures and relying on them for validation, individuals recognize their interdependence and come to form mutual respect (p. 400-401).

His theory of social construction integrates the cognitive and affective processes, and states the need for voluntary involvement of children in the social interaction.

Jordan has established a theory of development that is based on an integration of biological and psychological processes. Kalinowski and Jordan (1973) stated that;

> "the importance of a process is defined by two criteria: (1) the degree to which it engenders effectance (i.e., the degree of control over the environment it brings to an organism), and (2) the extent to which it is fundamental to other processes (i.e., the extent to which it creates or extends potentiality) (p. 19)."

Kalinowski and Jordan present their view of an integration of processes as basic to their theory. This integration is an essential component of moral development as well.

The organismic view of development was selected as the theoretical base for the moral development curriculum for

the in-service program. The organismic theories presented by Youniss and Jordan represent a broad perspective that encompasses the thinking of the cognitive and affective theorists. The organismic theory does not reject the other theories but places them in relationship to each other. Each theory has a role in moral development and was included as an aspect of the moral development curriculum established for the in-service program for teachers.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to review and critique the literature on moral development and to establish a theoretical basis for an in-service program. Several learning theories were reviewed and found to be limited for a moral development theory. They address environmental influences on learning but do not take into account the internal processes that take place within individuals.

Developmental theories were then reviewed and critiqued. The cognitive and affective developmental theories were found to be limited in their view of development as a whole. They view either cognition or affect as the basis to learning although substantial bodies of research support both views. The organismic theories of Youniss and Jordan were found to take into account a broad developmental scheme. The integration of cognitive,

affective, and volitional processes are an intricate part of their theory of moral development. Jordan in particular places an great emphasis on the interaction of all biological and psychological processes. Youniss has presented his 'relations theory' which places reciprocal interactions among individuals as a critical element of moral development.

The organismic view of development was therefore chosen to serve as the theoretical basis for the teacher in-service program used in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the prototype of the in-service program and explain the evaluation design for the study. The prototype for the in-service program was based on an organismic view of development. Piaget's theories were used as the foundation of the prototype, with Kohlberg's work being discussed as a comtemporary approach widely known and discussed in the literature. Both Piaget's and Kohlberg's work represent the cognitive view of development. Blasi's theory was included in the discussion to represent the affective aspects of moral development. The theories of Youniss and Jordan were then presented as representing the organismic view of development. Strategies and techniques for implementation of a moral development curriculum, based on the organismic view of development, were then presented. These included aspects of cognitive, affective, and volitional development as they impact on moral development.

Four in-service sessions were provided over a six month period. The specific goals and objectives developed and implemented for each session are presented in detail.

The evaluation design of this study included four major components. First, staff participating in the in-service

teacher training program completed an in-service questionnaire. Second, several groups of students whose teachers participated in the in-service program were involved in a card house activity. A pretest and posttest matched control group design was incorporated to assess the destructive, constructive, non-cooperative, and cooperative behaviors of these students as they worked on the activity. Third, selected students were asked to respond to stories on a student developmental rating scale. And fourth, the teachers of the students who completed the student developmental rating scale, completed a teacher rating scale for those students.

At the conclusion of the chapter, the scope and limitations of this study are presented and discussed.

In-Service Program Description

A major activity designed to execute this study was the in-service program on moral development. The program presented to teachers was described in terms of session goals and objectives. The agenda for each session specified the activities that took place during the presentations.

Program Goals

The two major program goals for the teacher in-service

activity were to assist teachers in developing an understanding of the contemporary theories concerning moral development, and to assist teachers in developing strategies for the implementation of specific techniques to foster moral development of children in their classrooms based on the organismic view of development.

Session Format

Each of the four in-service sessions presented included the session title, session goal, objectives, and agenda. This was the general format of the total in-service program. The in-service sessions were scheduled for one hour during regular in-service time.

I. SESSION 1: Overview of Contemporary Theories of Moral Development

A. Objectives
   1. To assist teachers in understanding contemporary theories of moral development.
   2. To assist teachers in understanding the organismic view of development.
   3. To assist teachers in understanding Piaget's investigations of moral judgment.

B. Agenda
   1. Discussion of contemporary theories of moral development.
      a. Learning theory
      b. Cognitive stage development theory
         (1). Piaget and Kohlberg
      c. Affective and volitional aspects of moral development
         (1). Blasi
      d. Holistic and organismic views of moral development
         (1). Youniss and Jordan

2. Discussion of Piaget's cognitive stage development theory.
   a. Use of stories in Piaget's investigations
   b. Concepts of moral realism and adult constraint
   c. Cooperation and the development of the idea of justice
3. Implications of an organismic view of moral development for the classroom.

II. SESSION 2: Consistency, Autonomy and Heteronomy

A. Objectives
1. To assist teachers in understanding the importance of consistency in the classroom.
2. To assist teachers in understanding the relationship of automony and heteronomy as described by Piaget.
3. To assist teachers in understanding specific teaching skills to enhance autonomy in the classroom.

B. Agenda
1. Discuss responses of stories of justice and lying.
2. Discuss consistency and its role in the child's understanding of cause and effect and reciprocal causality.
3. Discuss specific techniques to provide consistency in the classroom.
   a. Establish clear rules
   b. Establish cause and effect relationships between behavior and consequences
   c. Follow through on stated outcomes of rules
   d. Discuss retribution vs. restitution
4. Discuss specific techniques to foster autonomy in the classroom.
   a. Foster cooperation among students
   b. Encourage students to participate in decision and choice making
   c. Solicit student opinion and feelings about moral events

III. SESSION 3: Cooperative Strategies and Activities

A. Objectives
1. To assist teachers in understanding the

relationship between cooperative behaviors, moral development, and the concept of justice.
2. To assist teachers in understanding the role of cooperation, reciprocity, and mutual respect in the development of the concept of justice.
3. To assist teachers in learning specific teaching strategies and activities to foster cooperation in children.
4. To assist teachers in understanding the role of affect and volition in moral development as based on the organismic view of development.

B. Agenda
1. Review of Sessions I and II.
2. Discussion of the relationship between cooperative behaviors, moral development, and the concept of justice.
3. Discussion of the role of cooperation in fostering moral development and the concept of justice in children.
4. Presentation of specific teaching strategies and activities to foster cooperation in children.
5. Discussion of affect and volition in moral development.

IV. Session 4: The Concept of Cooperation

A. Objectives
1. To assist teachers in understanding cooperative vs. competitive strategies.
2. To assist teachers in understanding strategies for developing cooperation in children.
3. To assist teachers in understanding techniques to implement cooperative strategies.

B. Agenda
1. Overview of the in-service program.
2. Presentation of "Prisoner's Dilemma" to develop an understanding of cooperative vs. competitive behaviors.
3. Discussion of activities involving cooperative behaviors.
4. In-service program evaluation.

Evaluation Design

The major hypothesis set forth in this study was that a teacher in-service program in the area of moral development would result in significant growth in the moral development of children. One activity designed to test this hypothesis was an evaluation of the teacher's perception of the impact of the in-service program, focusing on the strategies and techniques teachers use to foster moral development. Another major activity of this study was an evaluation of the impact of the in-service program on children. A pretest and posttest matched group design was used to assess the impact of the in-service program on children. Also included in the evaluation was a student developmental rating scale and a teacher rating scale. There were also a number of variables (see Appendix A) which may have had an impact on the evaluation of this study.

Subjects

This study was conducted in a suburb of a major city in Southern New England. There were approximately 2600 children enrolled in the K-12 school system. The in-service program was provided for all the teachers and support staff in two of the three K-4 elementary schools in the town. The third elementary school was used as the

control. The population of the in-service program activity consisted of 26 regular classroom teachers and 12 certified support staff in grades K through four. The teachers had an average of 14 years service.

The total school district enrollment in grades K-4 was approximately 700. The racial breakdown in these grades is approximately 50% white, 48% black, and 2% other. California Achievement Test scores placed this town .5 years above the national average in grade 4.

The sample population for the study was all the children in grade four who could be matched by age, sex, and achievement with the control group. Nine groups, each containing four children, of the two experimental schools were matched with nine groups of children from the control school. The age of the children was matched within a +/- three month range. The achievement was matched by scores falling into the same standard deviation range for each child based on the California Achievement Test scores.

In-Service Questionnaire

An evaluation of the in-service program was completed by the teachers who participated in it. An in-service questionnaire assessed the teacher's perception of the impact the in-service program had on their teaching. This questionnaire was completed at the conclusion of the final

in-service session.

Card House Activity

The data from the pretest and posttest card house activity were collected by one examiner. The examiner was a graduate student at a local university who was majoring in education. She was trained for several hours prior to the collection of the pretest data. Specific attention was paid to observational techniques, directions given to the groups, and the physical environment. A sample group of children were asked to build a card house during the training session to identify and clarify the data collection procedures. After the groups were selected, the examiner met with the individual groups in a location outside the classroom to collect the pretest data. Students were given a simple set of directions. These directions stated that their task was to work toward building one card house structure as high as possible. The examiner tape recorded each session with approximately 15 minutes allowed for the task activity. Posttest data, using the same groups, were also collected in the same manner by the same examiner who collected the pretest data.

A coding system was developed to identify four groups of behaviors for the card house activity; destructive toward house, constructive toward house, non-cooperative

toward others, and cooperative toward others. The four groups of behaviors are defined below:

1. Destructive Toward House. Verbal or physical behaviors that interfere with the completion of the assigned task.
   a. defeatist attitude
   b. pessimistic attitude
   c. statements about building own house
   d. physical destruction of house

2. Constructive Toward House. Verbal or physical behaviors that facilitate the completion of the assigned task.
   a. helpful statements toward task
   b. comments about end product

3. Non-Cooperative Toward Others. Verbal or physical behaviors that interfere with positive interaction with others.
   a. blaming others
   b. sarcasm
   c. name calling
   d. blocking or stopping others' ideas

4. Cooperative Toward Others. Verbal or physical behaviors that facilitate positive interaction with others.
   a. statements that pull group together to accomplish task
   b. goal setting statements
   c. supportive and positive attitude

The entire staff who participated in the in-service program was asked to complete an in-service program questionnaire. This questionnaire assessed the impact the in-service program had on the teaching strategies and techniques of the individual teacher.

Cooperation among children was chosen as an operational definition for moral development, although it is recognized that many other behaviors could have been

used as operational definitions of moral development. Piaget (1932) presented us with the concept of moral development occurring as a child develops autonomy. He also viewed automony as the result of genuine cooperation within a social environment and felt that cooperative interaction among students was fundamental to moral development. Damon and Killen (1982) stated that they felt cooperation provides a positive atmosphere for learning moral concepts.

Cooperative behaviors were chosen for analysis in this study because they require an interaction among individuals, which is central to the organismic theory of development. Youniss (1983) stated that "cooperation is a construct that requires fleshing out if it is to be more than an assumed characteristic of children's relations (p. 216). Cooperation must be jointly constructed. It is not a given. It can be taught to children if given the opportunity to develop. Finkel (cited in Johnson, et al., 1984) stated that, "...dominant aim in the classroom should be cooperation (p. v). Cooperation is therefore an intricate part of the public school's social environment.

To study cooperative behavior in children, an activity was selected which required children work together in a cooperative manner. The building of a card house by a small group of students was utilized for this purpose.

Activities requiring moral reasoning and moral judgment were not selected for this study because of their controversy in translation to moral behavior. Research in the area of moral behavior led to activities involving cooperative vs. competitive behavior. Although these were of interest, a competitive game activity introduces other variables, such as culture and individual values. This would only serve to add another variable to the study. In addition, as Staub (1978) has stated, "the similarity between a person's behavior in such (competitive) games and his behavior in other settings might be slight or nonexistent." The card house activity was chosen after careful consideration because it required that a group of students work together toward a single goal, that it could be conducted in a school setting, and that limited skill would be necessary for a student to participate in the activity.

The pretest activity was conducted prior to the beginning of the first in-service session and the posttest activity was conducted three weeks after the conclusion of the final session. As stated earlier, moral development was defined operationally as cooperation, one of many behaviors that could possibly have been chosen. The specified task of building a single card house to a maximum height was designed to observe how a group of children would work together toward the task.

Student Developmental Rating Scale

Several students also participated in another activity to broaden the data collection base. The student developmental rating scale was administered at the conclusion of the posttest card house activity. One randomly selected student from each of the experimental groups and the matched student in the control group were asked a series of questions about a story or stories. These stories were read to the students from the 'student developmental rating scale' (see Appendix B). The student developmental rating scale is a selection of six stories from Piaget's (1932) work on moral judgment. The stories were selected from his work on clumsiness and stealing, lying, and justice and authority. Three developmental charts are provided (see Appendix C) which come primarily from a text on Piaget by Duska and Whelan (1975). The charts represent the content of statements children make at particular stages of development. The examiner recorded verbatim the responses made by the child for each story or series of stories.

Directions. The directions for administering the scale were given on the individual rating scales. The examiner read the stories and then asked specific questions listed under each. The scale was administered at the conclusion of the posttest group activity which occurred at

the completion of the in-service program.

Scoring. The scoring for each of the sets of stories corresponded to the developmental charts. The score for the stories regarding lying range from a high of 4 to a low of 1, while stories of clumsiness and stealing range from 2 to 1, and stories of justice and authority range from 3 to 1. The maximum raw score possible was 18 while the minimum was 6.

Teacher Rating Scale

The final evaluation component was the teacher rating scale (see Appendix D) which was designed on a Likert Scale. Eight questions were asked of the teachers of the students who were randomly chosen to participate in the student developmental rating scale. This teacher rating scale was completed approximately three weeks following the conclusion of the posttest card house activity. Teachers were asked to assess students in regards to their behavior within the school. The purpose of this scale was to obtain an assessment of the students' actual behavior in school in addition to the students' responses to situations described through stories acquired from the student developmental ratig scale.

Directions. Specific directions were given to the teachers on the rating scale. This scale was completed

shortly after the completion of the in-service program.

Scoring. The rating sheet was scored on the basis of the rank given by the teacher for each of the eight questions. The maximum raw score was 56 while the minimum score possible was 8.

Scope and Limitations

Scope

The study outlined in this dissertation had implications in the area of research on moral development. The in-service training program was implemented as a regular in-service program at the elementary school level. Moral development theory was translated into practice as these teachers put to use their newly acquired strategies and techniques to foster moral development in their students. The evaluation design was used to measure the impact on students moral behavior as a result of the in-service program. The setting for the evaluation activity and student developmental rating scale was their schools.

The inclusion of affect and volition as a part of the in-service program put in place an empirical study that was based on an organismic view of moral development. To date, few empirical studies have been conducted in a field experience to assess moral development. This field was

prime for research that may be helpful in clarifying the origins of moral development. For these reasons, this study was important for further research and empirical studies in this area.

The procedures for collecting data focused on measuring behavior as well as moral judgment. This approach, therefore, looked at the aspects of moral development which included the child's judgments as well as behavior.

Limitations

The limitations of this study come from its major strength. This strength is that the study was conducted as a field experience. The limitations that follow lie in the ability to control the variables that may have impact on the results of the study. The study design was a matched pretest and posttest, with additional posttest data collected and analyzed. Campbell and Stanley (1963) discuss several variables that limit the research outcome.

The first is history, which may allow for other events to have caused the difference between the pretest and the posttest data. In an experimental and control matched group design, history would be a minor consideration since events are as likely to occur to one group as the other.

The second variable mentioned is maturation. This

refers to the biological or psychological growth that would be expected to occur when a period of time between the pretest and posttest is nearly six months. To take into account the effects of maturation, a t-test was employed to determine the significance of the pretest and posttest results. The effects of maturation are taken into account by determining the differences from the pretest and the posttest for the experimental groups and then for the control groups. These data are then used to determine the level of significance.

The third variable is the effects of testing. This had little impact on the activity of card house building since this was an activity familiar to many children. The activity was also presented to students as a game and was therefore viewed as non-threatening.

The fourth variable is that of instrumentation. The observation of the activities and the administration of the student developmental rating scale was conducted by a single examiner to decrease differences in data collection judgment. The examiner was instructed to give the directions for the card house activity and the student developmental rating scale in exactly the same manner. This consistency was evident in part by listening to the tape recorded sessions.

The fifth variable is statistical regression. This had

little influence on this study because students were selected from the entire fourth grade population and were placed in groups of four by random selection. Each student was matched by ability only if they fell into the same standard deviation. Also, the control groups that were matched to the randomly selected experimental groups did not have extreme differences in their scores.

C H A P T E R I V

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze the results of the data that were collected as a result of the implementation of the prototype on the in-service teacher training program. The four aspects of the evaluation are described: the results obtained from the in-service program questionnaire, the analysis of the coded data collected from the pretest and posttest card house activity, the results of the student responses to the stories presented on the student developmental rating scales, and the responses from the teachers about specific students on the teacher rating scales.

In-Service Questionnaire

The development and implementation of an in-service program in the area of moral development was a major activity of this study. The projected outcome of the in-service program was that children would improve their cooperative behaviors as a result of the in-service program the teachers received. Moral development was operationalized in terms of cooperative behavior. All the teachers and support staff from the experimental school grades K-4 participated in four in-service program sessions. At the conclusion of the fourth session,

teachers were asked to complete an In-Service Program Questionnaire. Each question is presented in terms of the percentage of the thirty-eight (38) participants indicated a response at each level of the four level scale. The responses were as follows:

1. How useful was the material presented in the in-service program for your classroom?

   Very useful - 8%
   Useful - 18%
   Somewhat useful - 50%
   Not useful - 24%

2. Was the content of the workshop presented in an understandable manner?

   Very understandable - 26%
   Understandable - 66%
   Somewhat understandable - 8%
   Not understandable - 0%

3. Were the techniques presented in the in-service program applicable for you when working with your students?

   Very applicable - 13%
   Applicable - 11%
   Somewhat applicable - 63%
   Not applicable - 13%

4. As a result of the in-service program, do you feel you have a better understanding of moral development of children?

   Much better understanding - 11%
   Better understanding - 16%
   Somewhat better understanding - 37%
   No better understanding - 36%

5. As a result of the in-service program, do you feel your children have developed more cooperative behaviors?

   Much more cooperative behaviors - 8%
   More cooperative behaviors - 11%

Some cooperative behaviors - 28%
No change in cooperative behavior - 53%

The responses from the participants of the in-service program show positive responses to the questions concerning the presentation of the program with 76% indicating that the material presented was somewhat to very useful, 100% indicating that the workshop was somewhat to very understandable, and 87% indicating that the techniques were were somewhat to very applicable. This indicates a successful in-service program in terms of relevancy, clarity, and applicability. The responses of the participants to their own understanding of moral development was less positive, yet 64% stated they had a somewhat better to a much better understanding. The participants' perception of the impact the in-service program had on children was less than 50%, with 19% indicating that they had observed more or much more cooperative behaviors, 28% indicating that their children had developed some cooperative behaviors, and 53% seeing no change in cooperative behaviors. On two of the questionnaires, participants wrote that they felt the sessions needed to be longer and more in-depth, and they also felt that more time would be needed to see if cooperative behaviors would change.

Card House Activity

The null hypothesis set forth in this study was that there would be no differences in moral behavior between the experimental and control groups as a result of the inservice program. The level of significance was set at the .05 level. The results of this study showed that the null hypothesis was not rejected in all areas assessed for significance. A t-test was conducted on the pretest and posttest card house activity for the behavioral areas of destructive toward house, constructive toward house, non-cooperative toward others, and cooperative toward others. A t-test was also employed using a ratio analysis. A comparison was made of the cooperative behaviors to total cooperative behaviors and non-cooperative behaviors, and constructive behaviors to total constructive and destructive behaviors. A Q sort procedure was then used to determine if significant behaviors occurred at specific time segments during the card house activity.

A rank order correlation was then used to determine whether or not there was a relationship between the age of the students and the scores they received on the ratio analysis of cooperative behaviors and of constructive behaviors. A chi-square was also conducted to determine if the age and scores of the students were independent of each

other.

The results from the data collected for the pretest and posttest behavioral measures of the card house activity indicated that the experimental group showed a decrease in destructive behaviors toward the card house and a decrease in non-cooperative behaviors toward others when compared to the control group. There was also an increase shown in constructive behaviors toward the house. There was a decrease in cooperative behaviors toward others in both the experimental and control groups.

The data were obtained by having the first nine minutes of each of the 36 pretest and posttest groups' tapes transcribed verbatim. The tapes were coded by an impartial person who had no knowledge of which groups were the pretest and posttest or which were the experimental and control groups. The coding took place after an intensive training session with the coder and a second person who was used to determine the interrater reliability. All 36 tapes were coded with the first nine also being coded by the second person to determine the interrater reliability. The interrater reliability was established at 81%. Table 1 shows the correlated scores as a result of the interrater reliability procedure.

The results from the behavioral measures of the card house activity are described in each of the four behavioral

TABLE 1

Selected Experimental and Control Groups, Total Responses Coded, Number of Identical Responses, and Correlated Scores for Determining the Interrater Reliability of the Coding of the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	Total Responses Coded	Number of Identical Responses	Correlated Scores(%)
C-E	36	29	81
C-I	70	58	83
C-B	68	55	81
C-H	51	42	82
C-D	21	14	67
E-D	33	31	94
E-K	11	9	82
E-I	31	25	81
E-H	27	21	78

Total Correlated Interrater Reliability Score - 81

categories assessed; destructive toward house, constructive toward house, non-cooperative toward others, and cooperative toward others. The level of significance was determined by using a t-test.

Destructive Toward House

The number of destructive behaviors toward the house decreased in the experimental group as compared to the control group, although t was not significant, t = .73. Table 2 presents the data from the pretest and posttest. The incidence of behaviors representing a defeatist or pessimistic attitude by students or an active physical destruction of the card house decreased in the experimental group. The control group showed a slight increase in this area, which was predicted.

Constructive Toward House

The number of constructive behaviors toward the house increased in the experimental group while the number decreased in the control group, although t was not significant, t = .39. Table 3 shows the data from the pretest and posttest. The increase of constructive behaviors toward the house in the experimental group and the decrease in this behavior in the control group were findings in the predicted directions but these changes were

TABLE 2

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Squared of the Number of Destructive Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (exper)	5	0	-5	14.44
(cont)	3	9	6	34.81
B	6	8	2	10.24
	4	2	-2	4.41
C	6	6	0	1.44
	7	7	0	.01
D	3	8	5	38.44
	10	14	4	15.21
E	12	0	-12	116.64
	2	1	-1	1.21
F	3	2	-1	.04
	9	0	-9	82.81
G	7	9	2	10.24
	6	10	4	15.21
H	6	8	2	10.24
	7	3	-4	16.81
I	7	3	-4	7.84
	1	4	3	8.41
Total Scores				
Experimental	55	44	-11	209.56
Control	49	50	1	178.89
Mean Scores				
Experimental	6.11	4.89	-1.22	
Control	5.44	5.55	.11	

TABLE 3

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Squared of the Number of Constructive Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (exper)	2	1	-1	1.69
(cont)	0	10	10	106.09
B	3	2	-1	1.69
	2	1	-1	.49
C	2	2	0	.09
	6	0	-6	32.49
D	0	0	0	.09
	1	0	-1	.49
E	0	1	1	.49
	5	2	-3	7.29
F	0	3	3	7.29
	2	2	0	.09
G	2	1	-1	1.69
	6	9	3	10.86
H	0	1	1	.49
	6	1	-5	22.09
I	1	2	1	.49
	0	0	0	.09
Total Scores				
Experimental	10	13	3	14.01
Control	28	25	-3	180.01
Mean Scores				
Experimental	1.1	1.4	.3	
Control	3.1	2.8	-.3	

not judged to be significant.

Non-Cooperative Toward Others

The number of non-cooperative behaviors toward others decreased in the experimental group as compared to the control group, although *t* was not significant, *t* = 1.23. Table 4 shows the data from the pretest and posttest. The identified behaviors of blaming, sarcasm, or name calling were decreased in the experimental group with a slight increase occurring in the control group. Again, the increase was in the predicted direction.

Cooperative Toward Others

The number of cooperative behaviors toward others decreased in both the experimental and control groups with *t* not being significant, *t*= -.46. Table 5 shows the data from the pretest and posttest activity. The number of supportive and positive behaviors toward other students was not significantly different between the experimental and control groups.

A ratio analysis was conducted to determine if there were significant findings when cooperative and non-cooperative, and constructive and destructive behaviors were analyzed together. Table 6 represents the findings in percentages of cooperative behavior to the total

TABLE 4

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Squared of the Number of Non-Cooperative Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (exper)	4	0	-4	1.44
(cont)	6	2	-4	21.16
B	18	3	-15	96.04
	7	3	-4	21.16
C	15	20	5	104.04
	12	7	-5	31.36
D	27	8	-19	190.44
	13	13	0	.36
E	15	16	1	38.44
	10	7	-3	12.96
F	5	11	6	125.44
	3	34	31	924.16
G	19	13	-6	.64
	15	12	-3	12.96
H	18	14	-4	1.44
	25	12	-13	184.96
I	12	1	-11	33.64
	0	6	6	29.16
Total Score				
Experimental	133	86	-47	591.56
Control	91	96	5	1238.24
Mean Scores				
Experimental	14.8	9.6	-5.2	
Control	10.1	10.7	.6	

TABLE 5

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Squared of the Number of Cooperative Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (exper)	20	7	-13	68.89
(contl)	7	23	16	357.21
B	7	5	-2	7.29
	12	4	-8	26.01
C	20	4	-16	127.69
	11	2	-9	37.21
D	4	3	-1	13.69
	10	2	-8	26.01
E	9	12	3	59.29
	20	5	-15	146.41
F	8	8	0	22.09
	3	10	7	98.01
G	11	5	-6	1.69
	31	30	-1	3.61
H	14	22	8	161.29
	19	16	-3	.01
I	18	3	-15	106.09
	7	2	-5	4.41
Total Scores				
Experimental	111	69	-42	568.01
Control	120	94	-26	698.98
Mean Scores				
Experimental	12.3	7.6	-4.7	
Control	13.3	10.4	-2.9	

TABLE 6

Ratio Analysis in Percentages for Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental and Control Groups, and the Posttest Minus Pretest Gain or Loss for the Number of Cooperative to the Total Cooperative and Non-Cooperative Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	Pretest (%)	Posttest (%)	Pretest-Postest (%)
A (Exp)	21/21+5 =81	8/8+1 =89	8
(Cont)	8/8+7 =53	23/23+3 =89	36
B	8/8+19 =30	6/6+4 =60	30
	13/13+8 =62	5/5+4 =56	- 6
C	21/21+16=57	5/5+21 =19	-38
	12/12+13=48	3/3+8 =27	-21
D	5/5+28 =15	4/4+9 =31	16
	11/11+14=44	3/3+14 =18	-26
E	10/10+16=39	13/13+17=43	4
	21/21+11=66	6/6+8 =43	-23
F	9/9+6 =60	9/9+12 =43	-17
	4/4+4 =50	11/11+35=24	-26
G	12/12+20=38	6/6+14 =30	- 8
	32/32+16=67	31/31+13=70	3
H	15/15+19=38	23/23+15=61	23
	20/20+26=43	17/17+13=57	14
I	19/19+13=59	4/4+2 =67	8
	8/8+1 =89	3/3+7 =30	-59
Total Scores			
Experimental			26
Control			-108
Mean Scores			
Experimental			2.9
Control			-12.0

cooperative and non-cooperative behaviors on the pretest and posttest measures. There were improved behaviors measured by this ratio analysis although t was not significant, t= 1.369. Table 7 represents the findings in percentages of constructive behavior to the total constructive and destructive behaviors on the pretest and posttest measures. Again, there were improved behaviors measured by this analysis although t was not significant, t= 1.483.

A Q sort procedure was employed to determine the level of cooperation between students within particular time segments during the card house activity. Each nine minute card house activity was divided into four two and one quarter minute time segments creating four equal time segments or quadrants. The rater determined the level of cooperation present within each quadrant based upon a four point scale. A value of 1, 2, 3, or 4 was given to non-cooperative, somewhat non-cooperative, somewhat cooperative, or cooperative ratings, respectively. Interrater reliability was established at 75% from a sample of 20 quadrants. T-tests were conducted for each quadrant to determine if the null hypothesis would be rejected. Table 8 shows the scores obtained from quadrant 1 data. The findings were not significant, t= -.4574. Table 9 shows the scores obtained from quadrant 2 data. The

TABLE 7

Ratio Analysis in Percentages for Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental and Control Groups, and the Posttest Minus Pretest Gain or Loss for the Number of Constructive to the Total Constructive and Destructive Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	Pretest (%)	Posttest (%)	Pretest-Postest(%)
A (Exp)	3/3+6 =33	2/2+1 =67	34
(Cont)	1/1+4 =40	11/11+10=52	12
B	4/4+7 =36	3/3+9 =25	-11
	3/3+5 =38	2/2+3 =40	2
C	3/3+7 =30	3/3+7 =30	0
	7/7+8 =47	1/1+8 =11	-36
D	1/1+4 =20	1/1+9 =10	-10
	2/2+10 =17	1/1+14 = 7	-10
E	1/1+13 = 7	2/2+3 =66	66
	6/6+3 =67	3/3+2 =60	- 7
F	1/1+4 =20	4/4+3 =57	37
	3/3+10 =23	3/3+1 =75	52
G	3/3+8 =27	2/2+10 =18	- 9
	7/7+7 =50	10/10+11=48	- 2
H	1/1+7 =13	2/2+9 =18	5
	7/7+8 =47	2/2+4 =33	-14
I	2/2+8 =20	3/3+4 =43	23
	1/1+2 =33	1/1+5 =17	-16
Total Scores			
Experimental			128
Control			- 19
Mean Scores			
Experimental			14.2
Control			- 2.1

TABLE 8

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Scores Squared for Quadrant 1 Using a Q Sort Procedure for the Level of Cooperation During the Card House Activity (N=9)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (Exper)	4	4	0	.49
(Cont)	3	3	0	.19
B	4	4	0	.49
	4	4	0	.19
C	2	3	1	2.79
	3	3	0	.19
D	3	1	-2	1.77
	3	1	-2	2.43
E	2	1	-1	.11
	4	4	0	.19
F	4	1	-3	5.43
	3	2	-1	.31
G	3	4	1	2.79
	4	4	0	.19
H	4	2	-2	1.77
	4	3	-1	.31
I	4	4	0	.49
	4	4	0	.19
Total Scores				
Experimental	30	24	-6	16.13
Control	32	28	-4	4.19
Mean Scores				
Experimental	3.33	2.66	-.67	
Control	3.55	3.11	-.44	

TABLE 9

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Scores Squared for Quadrant 2 Using a Q Sort Procedure for the Level of Cooperation During the Card House Activity (N=9)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (Exper)	4	4	0	.19
(Cont)	4	4	0	.05
B	3	3	0	.19
	3	4	1	.61
C	4	2	-2	2.43
	1	2	1	.61
D	2	1	-1	.31
	3	4	1	.61
E	2	3	1	2.07
	4	3	-1	1.49
F	2	2	0	.19
	4	2	-2	4.93
G	4	4	0	.19
	4	4	0	.05
H	3	3	0	.19
	2	4	2	3.17
I	4	4	0	.19
	4	4	0	.05
Total Scores				
Experimental	27	25	-2	5.76
Control	29	31	2	11.57
Mean Scores				
Experimental	3.00	2.78	-.22	
Control	3.22	3.44	.22	

findings were not significant, t= -.9509. Table 10 shows the scores obtained from quadrant 3 data. The findings were not significant, t=.9403. Table 11 shows the scores obtained from quadrant 4 data. The findings were not significant, t=.3584.

A rank order correlation was conducted to determine whether or not there was a relationship between the age of the students and the score they received on the ratio analysis for cooperative behaviors and for constructive behaviors. The age rank order of the groups was determined by first computing each student's age in months. The student's ages in each group were then totaled providing each group with a total age expressed in months. The groups were then rank ordered from oldest to youngest. The rank order was divided in half to create two groups, the youngest group and the oldest group. There was approximately seven months difference between these two groups. The ratio analysis scores previously calculated were rank ordered from most gain to least gain obtained. Table 12 shows the data used and the rank order obtained for age and ratio analysis scores for cooperative behaviors.. The findings were not significant, t=.16. Table 13 shows the data used as the rank order obtained for age and ratio analysis for constructive behaviors. The findings were not significant, t= -.8029.

TABLE 10

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Scores Squared for Quadrant 3 Using a Q Sort Procedure for the Level of Cooperation During the Card House Activity (N=9)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (Exper)	3	4	1	1.77
(Cont)	4	3	-1	.61
B	3	4	1	1.77
	3	3	0	.05
C	2	1	-1	.45
	1	1	0	.05
D	3	1	-2	2.79
	1	1	0	.05
E	3	2	-1	.45
	4	4	0	.05
F	4	2	-2	2.79
	3	1	-2	3.17
G	2	2	0	.11
	4	4	0	.05
H	2	2	0	.11
	2	3	1	1.49
I	3	4	1	1.77
	4	4	0	.05
Total Scores				
Experimental	25	22	-3	12.01
Control	26	24	-2	5.57
Mean Scores				
Experimental	2.77	2.44	-.33	
Control	2.89	2.67	.22	

TABLE 11

Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups, Posttest Minus Pretest, and the Mean Difference Scores Squared for Quadrant 4 Using a Q Sort Procedure for the Level of Cooperation During the Card House Activity (N=9)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest-Pretest	d^2
A (Exper)	3	4	1	.45
(Cont)	3	4	1	.19
B	3	3	0	.11
	4	3	-1	2.43
C	3	2	-1	1.77
	3	2	-1	2.43
D	2	1	-1	1.77
	3	1	-2	6.55
E	3	2	-1	1.77
	3	4	1	.19
F	2	3	1	.45
	3	2	-1	2.43
G	3	1	-2	5.43
	4	4	0	.31
H	3	3	0	.11
	2	2	0	.31
I	4	4	0	.11
	4	2	-2	6.55
Total Scores				
Experimental	26	23	-3	11.97
Control	29	24	-5	21.39
Mean Scores				
Experimental	2.89	2.56	-.33	
Control	3.21	2.67	-.56	

TABLE 12

Rank Order Correlation of the Mean Age in Months of the Experimental and Control Groups to the Percentages of the Ratio Analysis of Cooperative to Non-Cooperative Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	X Score (Mean Age)	Y Score (Ratio Analysis)	X Rank	Y Rank
A (Exp)	442	8	18	7
(Cont)	447	36	16	1
B	456	30	6	2
	458	- 6	5	10
C	446	-38	17	17
	451	-21	10	13
D	467	16	3	4
	467	-26	4	16
E	470	4	1	8
	468	-23	2	14
F	452	-17	9	12
	447	-26	15	15
G	447	- 8	14	11
	454	3	7	9
H	450	23	11	3
	453	14	8	5
I	449	8	13	6
	450	-59	12	18

$\hat{p}$ = .0392 $\quad$ $\underline{t}$ = .1600

TABLE 13

Rank Order Correlation of the Mean Age in Months of the Experimental and Control Groups to the Percentages of the Ratio Analysis of Constructive to Destructive Behaviors Observed During the Card House Activity
(N=9)

Group	X Score (Mean Age)	Y Score (Ratio Analysis)	X Rank	Y Rank
A (Exp)	442	34	18	4
(Cont)	447	-12	16	6
B	456	-11	6	15
	458	2	5	8
C	446	0	17	9
	451	36	10	18
D	467	-10	3	14
	467	-10	4	13
E	470	59	1	1
	468	- 7	2	11
F	452	37	9	3
	447	52	15	2
G	447	- 9	14	12
	454	- 2	7	10
H	450	5	11	7
	453	-14	8	16
I	449	23	13	5
	450	-16	12	17

$\hat{p}$ = -.2219 $\quad$ $\underline{t}$ = -.8029

A chi-square was conducted to test the null hypothesis that age and the scores obtained on the ratio analysis of cooperative behavior to total cooperative and non-cooperative behaviors are independent of one another. The 18 groups rank ordered by age were divided into two groups of 9, the younger group ranging in age from 442 months to 451 months, and the older group ranging in age from 453 months to 470 months. Groups who made gains in cooperative behavior determined by the ratio analysis were placed in the plus (+) row. Groups who received losses in cooperative behaviors were placed in the minus (-) column. The results of the chi-square test procedure are shown in Table 14. Since the observed value of x does not exceed the tabulated chi-square value, the null hypothesis was not rejected; df=1, $cv_{.05}$ =3.84, χ^2=.224.

A chi-square was also conducted to test the null hypothesis that age and the scores obtained on the ratio analysis of constructive to total constructive and destructive behaviors are independent of one another. The same test procedure described above was employed for this analysis. The results of the chi-square test procedure are shown in Table 15. Since the observed value of x does not exceed the tabulated chi-square value, the null hypothesis was not rejected; df=1, $cv_{.05}$ =3.84, χ^2=1.78.

TABLE 14

Chi-Square of Younger Groups of Students (Y) and Older Groups of Students (X) to Gains (+) and Losses(-) of Groups Determined by the Ratio Analysis for Cooperative Behaviors (N=9)

	X(+)	X(-)	Y(+)	Y(-)
Observed	5	4	4	5
Expected	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
O - E	.5	-.5	-.5	.5
(O - E)	.25	.25	.25	.25
$\frac{(O - E)}{E}$	.056	.056	.056	.056

df=1 $CV_{.05}$ =3.84 X^2=.224

TABLE 15

Chi-Square of Younger Groups of Students (Y) and Older Groups of Students (X) to Gains (+) and Losses(-) of Groups Determined by the Ratio Analysis for Constructive Behaviors (N=9)

	X(+)	X(-)	Y(+)	Y(-)
Observed	3	5	7	3
Expected	4.4	3.6	5.6	4.4
O - E	-1.4	1.4	1.4	-1.4
(O - E)	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
$\frac{(O - E)}{E}$	.445	.544	.35	.445

df=1 $CV_{.05}$ =3.84 X^2=1.78

Student Developmental Rating Scales

As a part of the evaluation design, data were collected on student cognitive responses to moral situations. The major limitation of the student rating scale was that only nine students were evaluated by these instruments. In the public school where this study took place, certain factors prohibited direct contact with all 72 students who participated in the card house activity. The scales and results of the evaluation have been included with recognition of this limitation.

One student from each of the nine experimental groups was selected at random. At the conclusion of the posttest card house activity, each student was asked to respond verbally to the student developmental rating scale (SDRS), which consisted of six of Piaget's stories; two on Justice and Authority, two on Lying, and two on Clumsiness and Stealing (see Appendix B). The SDRS was scored using developmental charts (see Appendix C). Each of the raw scores on the SDRS was converted into percentages out of a possible score of 100. The students in the control groups matched to the students in the experimental groups also responded to the SDRS. Table 16 outlines the students' responses to the scale.

The results of the rating scales show there was no difference between the experimental and control groups on

TABLE 16

Summary of the Scores Obtained in Percentages for the Experimental and Control Groups on the Student Developmental Rating Scales
(N=9)

Group	Experimental (%)	Control (%)
A	83	78
B	67	78
C	83	72
D	94	89
E	78	83
F	83	72
G	67	89
H	78	72
I	83	83
Total Score	79.5	79.5
Mean Score	80	80
Standard Deviation	8.01	6.50

the SDRS. As measured by these scales, the results indicate that the in-service program had little or no effect on the students' increased cooperative behaviors.

Teacher Rating Scale

The final component of the evaluation, the teacher rating scale (see appendix D), was given to teachers to complete three weeks after the completion of the in-service program. The teachers of the students who completed the student developmental rating scales were asked to complete this scale. The limitations cited for the student developmental rating scale also applied to the teacher rating scale. The raw scores obtained on the teacher rating scale were converted into percents out of a possible score of 100. The results obtained on this scale are shown in Table 17.

The results of the teacher rating scale indicated little difference between the experimental and control groups. As measured by this scale, the in-service program had little effect on the cooperative behaviors of children.

Summary

The result of this study showed no significant difference in moral behaviors between the experimental and control groups. The activities implemented to assess this

TABLE 17

Summary of the Scores Obtained in Percentages for the Experimental and Control Groups on the Teacher Rating Scales
(N=9)

Group	Experimental (%)	Control (%)
A	89	88
B	98	73
C	88	41
D	98	95
E	46	93
F	57	100
G	100	32
H	55	89
I	68	80
Total Score	699	691
Mean Score	77.6	76.7
Standard Deviation	20.0	22.9

study were an in-service questionnaire, a card house activity, a student developmental rating scale, and a teacher rating scale. A t-test was used to determine the level of significance between the pretest and posttest results of the experimental and control groups. The statistical procedures of ratio analysis, Q-sort technique, rank order correlation, and chi-square also failed to find any significant differences as a result of the in-service teacher training program.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the data collected from the evaluation of the card house activity did not show substantial differences between experimental and control groups and therefore the null hypothesis in all four of the behavioral categories was not rejected. The data obtained showed that the experimental group had a decrease in destructive behaviors toward the house, a decrease in non-cooperative behaviors toward others, and an increase in constructive behaviors toward the house as compared to the control group, although the differences were not significant. The behavioral area of cooperation toward others decreased in both the experimental and control groups with no differences being observed.

Several additional statistical tests were conducted to assess significant differences among and between groups. These findings also showed that the null hypothesis was not rejected. A ratio analysis of cooperative and non-cooperative behaviors, and constructive and destructive behaviors found no significant differences as did a Q sort procedure conducted for specific time periods during the card house activity. A rank order correlation and chi-square determined that age and the score obtained on the ratio analysis were independent of each other.

The student developmental rating scales and the teacher rating scales did not find any significant differences between the experimental and control groups for student jugdment on selected stories and on teacher perception of student behavior.

The findings have not supported the hypothesis that an in-service program for teachers would have a significant impact on children. The changes and modifications believed necessary to show significant results from the implementation of an in-service teacher training program in moral development are outlined in this chapter. The major strengths and limitations of this study are first discussed, followed by recommendations for changes. The implications for future research are then discussed.

The lack of a significant finding in this study should serve as a motivation and not as a deterrent for researchers to explore this severely overlooked critical area. The theoretical framework presented in this study sets forth the basis for a comprehensive, coherent theory of education. The teacher training in-service program represents a first step in the development, implementation, and evaluation of a moral development curriculum based on an organismic theory of development.

Research and In-Service Program

The major contribution of this study was that a theoretical framework was fleshed out from contemporary theories of moral development and a teacher training in-service program was developed, implemented, and evaluated as a first step in putting into practice a moral development curriculum based on an organismic theory of development. Other strengths included the support given by administration, the format of the sessions which gave teachers an opportunity to practice the techniques they had learned, and the coöperation of many of the teachers who participated in the program.

The Anisa Model, which is based on an organismic theory of development, is a comprehensive, coherent theory of education. This model served as the theoretical framework for the moral development curriculum established for this study. The moral development curriculum, which was derived from the larger organismic theory of the Anisa Model, addresses all aspects of psychological and biological development. This study was a demonstration of the application of the moral development curriculum derived from the larger model, but put in place in a system that does not adhere to the entire model as its basis of education. The implementation of this study was seen as a possible solution to the problem of not having a moral

development curriculum in public schools.

Other strengths were that the central administration and the building principals of both the experimental and control groups gave their support for the program. With a limited amount of in-service time available throughout the school year, the four sessions available were a large part of the total in-service time.

The format of the in-service program was also a strength. A pilot was implemented the previous year for pre-school staff and early childhood educators. This gave many clues to the style of presentation. Group discussions and role playing activities dominated the presentation. Staff reported at each session on the 'homework' that was given. This involved the teachers actually trying out different activities with their classes and reporting back to the group their results. The strategies and techniques that were presented were practical for application in the regular classroom. Teacher support was evident by the feedback received on the results of their interactions with their children.

The major limitation of this study was the lack of thorough training of teachers in the Anisa Modal. No attempt was made to train teachers to understand the entire Model. Only a limited amount of training occurred for teachers to understand moral development based on the

organismic theory of development. Teachers were primarily introduced to the strtegies and techniques they could use within their classrooms. A brief overview was given on contemporary theories of moral development, presenting the organismic view of development as a framework in which the strategies and techniques lie.

Other limitations of the in-service program also need to be addressed. The limitation of the number of sessions seriously affected the impact of the in-service program. Four sessions were not sufficient to provide adequate training for teachers on the subject of moral development. Not only is the topic of curriculum strategies and techniques new to teachers, but the theoretical foundations of moral development are just emerging in the research. Little time was available for teachers to thoroughly grasp and understand the organismic theoretical framework. Other critical issues for teachers, such as ethics, were raised but not addressed because of the lack of sessions available. With most of one session used to discuss the contemporary theories of moral development, only three sessions remained to teach strategies and techniques for classroom implementation. These sessions were used to discuss the major strategies and techniques of the model with little time available to get into specific behaviors and concerns that teachers encountered in their classrooms.

The length and time of day of the in-service sessions were also limitations of the program. The one hour sessions were held directly after the students were dismissed from school. This was not an ideal time for an in-service program. Teachers were often tired and were not always attending to the task. The use of activities to involve participants helped to keep teacher attention to the task but this was not effective for all teachers.

The length, as well as the number, of sessions greatly diminished the amount of positive feedback that was given to teachers. Teachers who attempted to implement the strategies and techniques presented, had no support system or feedback available to them. Little time was spent during the in-service sessions to provide this support especially with approximately 38 participants attending every session.

The commitment of the teachers to change their teaching style with children was limited. Teachers were not involved in the planning and decision making of the in-service program. They were told that they were to participate in the program as a part of the total in-service program for the year, but had no input into the program planning. Strategies for change were not addressed as a part of this program implementation.

The following is a list of recommendations for

implementing an in-service program for teachers based on the results of this study:

1. Teachers receive an intensive training in an organismic theoretical framework based on the Anisa Model to develop their understanding of a comprehensive theory of education. This will help them to better understand the integration of a moral development curriculum into the regular education curricula.

2. The implementation of an in-service program in the area of moral development be comprehensive and be conducted over a two to three year period.

3. In-house specialists be trained prior to the in-service program to act as a support system to teachers, to give immediate feedback to teachers when questions arise, and that demonstration and modeling be used as an on-going method of training.

4. The expectations for behavioral change be long term with support being given not only for an outcome, but also for implementation of the techniques.

5. The curriculum be constantly in process and able to change with the changing needs of our society.

6. The goals and objectives of the in-service program be frequently reviewed to meet the changing needs of our society.

7. Parent involvement be actively sought with encouragement for their participation in some aspect of the training of moral development.

The need for a comprehensive in-service program based on the Anisa Model is essential for staff to understand how moral development is grounded in the total educational program. Teachers often view the introduction of a new program as more work. It is necessary to develop teacher

understanding that a moral development curriculum is not something taught as a specific content area or at a designated time of day, but is an approach underlying every activity occurring and every content area taught throughout the school day. It is an attitude that must develop in teachers so they approach every interaction occurring within the school setting as an opportunity to teach moral development.

The development of this attitude in a school staff requires an in-service program to be implemented over a two to three year period. This length of time would be necessary for teachers to understand an organismic theoretical framework and systematically apply the strategies and techniques within their classrooms. This period of time would also give teachers an understanding of the administration's commitment to the program and the knowledge that there is an expectation of change on the part of them.

The majority of the sessions of the in-service program should take place during the summer with the in-service time during the year used to support aspects of the program implementation. In-service sessions throughout the school year would focus on the immediate needs of each individual school and should be derived from the teacher's input.

The need of an in-house specialist would be necessary

to provide feedback to staff on an immediate basis. This feedback would come on a daily basis if needed. It would be provided for staff as they attempted to make sense of the theory. The specialist would assist teachers as they attempted to translate theoru into practice. Feedback would also be provided for teachers making attempts at implementing the curriculum as well as for teachers who are able to demonstrate the impact of their interventions. This specialist would be available to demonstrate actual techniques to teachers within their classrooms, serve as a general resource to staff, and provide ideas and materials as needed. In addition, the specialist would assist or lead the in-service sessions occurring during the school year and those being conducted during the summer.

The in-house specialist and the administration would need to support staff efforts in attempting the techniques and strategies used in implementing the moral development curriculum. Immediate behavior change in students does not often occur after moral development techniques have been employed. Behavior change usually occurs over an extended period of time. For this reason, teachers need support for attempts in implementing the curriculum as well as for the actual behavior change that may occur.

A moral development curriculum should never be static but should constantly be in a state of change. Techniques

that are taught to teachers should be generative in nature. Teachers should be encouraged to adapt the techniques to their own special situation and needs. Relevant topics and issues concerning children today would be the basis for instruction in moral development.

As the in-service program is implemented, the initial goals and objectives would be constantly reviewed and modified if necessary. The changes would reflect the needs that the teachers identify as they work with the children. A feedback system from the teachers to the administration would serve to constantly monitor the program implementation and to modify the direction of the program. This approach would help insure that the in-service sessions were relevant to the needs of the staff.

Parent involvement would be actively sought throughout the entire program. It would begin at some phase of program development and continue through its implementation. Parent groups would be developed to deal with the concerns and issues generated from the program implementation. Parent training sessions may develop as a need and would be made available. The more parent involvement obtained, the more support and positive impact received for the program implementation.

Evaluation Design

The strength of this study was its being conducted as a field experiment using a quasi-experimental research design. The use of a pretest and posttest, experimental and control, matched group design established this research as legitimate. Although there are limitations in any field experiment, the setting in which the study occurs is a natural environment. The influence that may be brought to bear by teachers, administrators, and parents occur everyday in a public school.

A major limitation of this study was that is was not conducted as a longitudinal study. The pretest data were collected just prior to the first in-service session. The posttest data were collected several weeks after the conclusion of the fourth and final in-service session. A time period of approximately six months had elapsed. The expectation that a significant change in the moral behavior of children could be assessed in this time period may not have been realistic. Another limitation was the length of the in-service program. The treatment of only four hours of training was modest.

The results obtained from the data gathered on the SDRS and the TRS also failed to indicate any substantial change in student behavior. As stated earlier, the low number of students who participated in this aspect of the

evaluation was a major limitation of the research design.

There are several considerations that need to be entertained to develop a research design that can accurately assess the impact of an in-service program on children. A longitudinal research design of at least several years, paired with an in-service program extending over a two to three year period would need to be conducted. The impact of a systematic in-service program with data collection occurring twice each year would be able to accurately measure changes in moral behavior. The difficulty in identifying subtle behavior changes would be addressed by conducting a longitudinal study. The development of well designed, reliable, and valid instruments would also need to be considered. Assessment tools would need to be designed using appropriate test construction procedures and be field tested prior to their use in the study.

Future Research

At present, there is an obvious lack of studies being conducted as field experiments in the area of moral development. Most of the research that is being conducted focuses on the cognitive aspect of moral development: moral reasoning. The development of affective and volitional skills is an intricate part of moral development research.

Several researchers have incorporated these skills into their theoretical models. These models need to be tested out to find a scheme that views cognitive, affective, and volitional development as essential aspects of moral development.

Longitudinal studies need to be conducted as field experiments. These experiments could provide the most useful data regarding moral development. To conduct this research as field experiments, a marriage between the universities and public schools would probably needs to occur. The universities would provide the theoretical and technological knowledge along with the personpower necessary to carry out and evaluate the experiments. The public schools would provide the physical environment as well as the teachers, students and parents for the experiment. This marriage would produce a naturalistic setting where quality research can take place.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blasi, A. Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1980, 88, 1-45.

Brennan, J.F. History and systems of psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Brooks, C.I. Hull's drive theory. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Brooks, J. Marketing the public school. Educational Leadership, November 1982, 22-24.

Brown, F.G. Principles of educational and psychological testing (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Candee, D. Structure and choice in moral reasoning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1293-1301.

Carlson, J.G. Guthrie's theory of learning. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Catania, A.C. Operant theory: Skinner. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Cook,T.D., & Campbell,D.T. Quasi-experimentation: design and analysis issues for field settings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.

Damon, W., & Killen, M. Peer interaction and the process of change in children's moral reasoning. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1982, 28(3), 347-367.

Duska, R., & Whelan, M. Moral development: A guide to Piaget and Kohlberg. Paulist Press, 1975.

Forman, G.E. Constructivism: Piaget. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Gallup, G. H. The 12th annual gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1980, 33-48.

Gallup, G. H. The 13th annual gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1981, 33-47.

Ginsburg, H. & Opper, S. Piaget's theory of intellectual development (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1979.

Gruber, H. E., & Voneche, J. J. (Eds.). The essential Piaget. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Henry, R. M. The cognitive versus psychodynamic debate about morality. Human Development, 1983, 26, 173-179.

Holland, C.J., & Kobasigawa, A. Observational learning: Bandura. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., Holubec, E.J., & Roy, P. Circles of learning. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, publication stock no. 611-84324, 1984.

Jordan, D. C., & Shepard, R. P. The philosophy of the anisa model. World Order, 1972, 7, 23-31.

Jordan, D. C., & Streets, D. T. The ANISA model: A new basis for educational planning. Young Children, 1973, 28, 289-307.

Kalinowski, M. F., & Jordan, D. C. Being and becoming: The ANISA theory of development. World Order, 1973, 7, 17-26.

Kohlberg, L. The concepts of developmental psychology as a central guide to education: Examples from cognitive, moral, and psychological education. In M.C. Reyonalds (Ed.), Proceedings of the Conference on Psychology and the Process of Schooling in the Next Decade: Alternative Concepts. U.S. Office of Education: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, 1973.

Kohlberg, L. & Hersh, R. H. Moral development: A review of the theory. Theory Into Practice, April 1977, XVI(2), 53-59.

Locke, D. Doing what comes morally. Human Development, 1983, 26, 11-25.

Marx, M.H., & Hillix, W.A. Systems and theories in psychology (3rd ed..). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Murphy, G., Kovach, J.K. Historical introduction to modern psychology (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.,

Nucci, L. P. Conceptual development in the moral and conventional domains: Implications for values education. Review of Educational Research, Spring 1982, 52(1), 93-122.

Nucci, L. P. The distinction between morality and social convention: Implications for values instruction. Phi Delta Kappan, March 1981, 489-493.

Peisach, E., & Hardeman, M. Moral reasoning in early childhood: Lying and stealing. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1983, 142, 107-120.

Perkins, D.G. Classical conditioning: Pavlov. In G.M. Gazda & R.J. Corsisi (Eds.), Theories of learning: A comparative approach. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Porter, N., & Taylor, N. How to assess the moral reasoning of students (No. 8). Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute For Studies in Education, 1972.

Simon, S. B. Values clarification. New York: A. W. Publishers, 1978.

Sowell, E.J., & Casey, R.J. Analyzing educational research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982.

Staub, E. Positive social behavior and morality. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Whitehead, A. N. Process and reality. New York: Free Press, 1978.

Whitehead, A.N. The aims of education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1957.

Youniss, J. Dialectical theory and Piaget on social knowledge. Human Development, 1978, 21, 234-247.

Youniss, J. Moral development through a theory of social construction: An analysis. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1981, 27, 385-403.

Youniss, J. Piaget and the self constituted through relations. In W. F. Overton (Ed.), The relationship between social and cognitive development. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.

APPENDIX A

Variables

Independent Variable - the independent variable was the training of teachers in the area of moral development.

Dependent Variable - the dependent variable was the growth in the moral development of children as a result of the in-service program. Operationally for this study, an increase in cooperative and constructive behaviors was an increase in moral development. There may have been multiple effects of improvement of other operational behaviors, but for purposes of this study, cooperative and constructive behaviors were the primary targeted behaviors.

Intervening Variable - the intervening variables are the sex, age and achievement of the students who participated in this study. Experimental groups were matched with control groups to take these variables into account.

APPENDIX B

Student: _____

Student Developmental Rating Scale

Directions: The student developmental rating scale is to be administered on a 1:1 basis. After reading each story to the student, the student relates the story or set of stories to the examiner except where directions otherwise specify. The student is then asked specific questions listed below. Record as much of the response as possible to help make the determination of the appropriate stage of development of the student.

Justice and Authority

1. "There was a big boy in school once who was beating a smaller boy. The little one couldn't hit back because he wasn't strong enough. So one day during recess, he hid the big boy's lunch."

Q. What do you think of that?

Lying

2. A. "A boy couldn't draw very well but he would have liked very much to be able to draw better. One day he was looking at a very lovely drawing that another boy had done, and said: 'I did that drawing.'"

B. "A boy was playing with the scissors one day when his mother was out and he lost them. When his mother came home he said that he hadn't seen them and hadn't touched them."

Q. Why did the boy say that? (ask after each story)

Q. Which of the two boys is the naughtiest?

Clumsiness and Stealing

3. A. "Alan meets a little friend of his who is very poor. This friend tells him that he has had no dinner that day because there was nothing to eat in his home. Then Alan goes into a baker's shop and as he had no money, he waits until the baker's back is turned and he steals some bread. Then he runs out and gives the bread to his friend."

B. "Trinny goes into a store. She sees a pretty piece of ribbon on a table and thinks to herself that it would look very nice in her hair. So while the store owner's back is turned, she steals the ribbon and runs out the store."

Q. Are these children equally guilty?

Q. Which of the two is the naughtiest and why?

Clumsiness and Stealing

4. "One afternoon on a holiday, a mother had taken her children for a walk along a river. At four o'clock she gave each of them a sandwich to eat. They all began to eat their sandwiches except the youngest child, who was careless and let his fall into the water."

Q. What will the mother do?

Q. Will she give him another one?

Q. What will the older children say?

Justice and Authority

5. A. "Clara had a little friend who kept a bird in a cage. Clara thought the bird was very unhappy, and she was always asking her friend to let him out. But the friend wouldn't. So one day when her friend wasn't there, Clara went and stole the bird. She let it fly away and hid the cage in the attic so that the bird should never be shut up in it again."

B. "Juliet stole some candy from her mother one day when her mother was not there, and hid and ate them up."

Q. Are these children equally guilty?

Q. Which of the two is the naughtiest?

Lying

6. A. "A child who didn't know the names of streets very well was not quite sure where Wintonbury Avenue was. One day a man stopped him in the street and asked him where Wintonbury Avenue was. So the boy answered, 'I think it is there.' But it was not there. The man completely lost his way and could not find the house he was looking for."

B. " A boy knows the names of the streets quite well. One day a man asked him where Wintonbury Ave is. But the boy wanted to play a trick on him and said, it is there, and showed him the wrong street. But the man didn't get lost and managed to find his way again."

Q. Why did the boy say that? (ask after each story)

Q. Which of the two boys was the naughtiest and why?

APPENDIX C

Developmental Charts

STAGES OF JUSTICE AND AUTHORITY

STAGE	AGE 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
EQUITY	XXXXXXXX
EQUALITY OUTWEIGHS OBEDIENCE	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
JUST WHAT IS COMMANDED	XXXXXXXXX

CLUMSINESS AND STEALING

STAGE	AGE 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
SUBJECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
OBJECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY	XXXXXXX

DEFINITIONS OF A LIE

STAGE	AGE 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
ANY STATEMENT INTENTIONALLY FALSE	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
SOMETHING THAT ISN'T TRUE	XXXXXXXXX
SOMETHING THAT ISN'T TRUE INCLUDING MISTAKES	XXXXXXXXXX
A NAUGHTY WORD	XXXXXX

APPENDIX D

Teacher Rating Scale

Directions: Please answer each of the following questions with the response that best reflects your objective evaluation of the student's demonstrated behavior. Be certain to answer every question and circle the specific number that best indicates your evaluation.

1. Does the student work well with other students?

never works well					always works well
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

2. Does the student generally share with other students?

never shares					always shares
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

3. Does the student initiate helping behavior toward other students?

never initiates					always initiates
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

4. Is the student genarally cooperative in daily school activities?

very uncooperative					very cooperative
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

5. Does the student take responsibility for the rules of the classroom?

never takes responsibility					always takes responsibility
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

6. Does the student respect others and their belongings?

never respects others					always respects others
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

7. Does the student tell the truth about events or situations occurring in school?

never tells the truth					always tells the truth	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Does the student play well in group or team activities?

never plays well					always plays well	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7